



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, ps  
422 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 424  
Spokane WA 99201

**COPY MAILED**

**AUG 22 2008**

In re Application of	:	
Edward A. Hubbard	:	
Application No.: 09/834785	:	DECISION ON
Filing or 371(c) Date: 04/13/2001	:	PETITION
Attorney Docket Number: NING0008	:	

This is a decision in response to the petition to withdraw holding of abandonment, filed February 23, 2007. The petition is properly treated as a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment based upon failure to receive an Office action under 37 CFR 1.181. The delay in treating this petition is regretted.

This Petition is hereby **dismissed**.

Any further petition must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under [insert the applicable code section]." This is **not** final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to timely and properly reply to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due (Notice"), mailed July 25, 2006. The Notice set a three (3) month period for reply. No extensions of time were available. No reply having been received, the application became abandoned on October 26, 2006. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed December 26, 2006.

**Petition under 37 CFR 1.181**

Petitioner herein, the law firm of Fish & Richardson, files the present petition and asserts that the Notice was never received. In support of this assertion, Petitioner states that a search of the physical file and docket records indicate that the Notice was not received. Petitioner also files a copy of a docket record from the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick, the attorneys of record at the time the Notice was mailed. A review of the copy of the docket records from Winstead Sechrest & Minick indicate that the Notice was not received. No statement from anyone at the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick, attesting to a search of the file jacket and docket records has been conducted, or that the search of the physical file and docket records indicate that the Notice was not receive, has been filed.

It is also noted that the law firm of Fish & Richardson are no longer the attorneys of record in the application.

Applicable Law, Rules and MPEP

The MPEP 711.03(c)A, Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment Based on Failure To Receive Office Action, provides

In *Delgar v. Schulyer*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of *Delgar* is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133). To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response. Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required. A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question. The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions). (Emphasis supplied)

MPEP 711.03(c)

Analysis

Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the Notice was not received. In support of the petition, Petitioner states that a search of the physical file and docket records indicate that the Notice was not received; however, Petitioner was not the practitioner of record at the time the Notice was mailed. The law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick, were the attorneys of record at the time the Notice was mailed, and a copy of the docket records from Winstead Sechrest & Minick was filed; however, no statement from anyone at the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick, attesting to non-receipt of the Notice, or attesting to a search of the file jacket and docket records, or that the search of the physical file and docket records indicate that the Notice was not receive, has been filed. Moreover, no copy of the master docket for the firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick has been filed. A copy of the master docket record showing all replies docketed for a date three (3) months from the mail date of the Notice is required.

The petition is dismissed without prejudice. Applicant should file a Request for Reconsideration of Petition and include the necessary statement(s), copies of docket records and/or file jacket.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                    Director for Patents  
                                 PO Box 1450  
                                 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX:                    (571) 273-8300  
                                 Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand:                   Customer Service Window  
                                 Randolph Building  
                                 401 Dulany Street  
                                 Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3232.

/Derek L. Woods/  
Derek L. Woods  
Attorney  
Office of Petitions